UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,328	08/01/2003	John R. Ferguson	203998-1 (5024-00344)	5231

26753 7590 08/06/2008

ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP
100 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE, SUITE 1100
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202

EXAMINER	
CHAUHAN, LOREN B	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2193	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/06/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/632,328	FERGUSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Loren Chauhan	2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 August 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-49* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-49* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *8/1/2003, 3/17/2006*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-49 are pending for examination in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 1-8, 16-27 and 36-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

a. Claims 1-8, 16-27 and 36-38 are directed to a system; but the body of the claims does not have any hardware support for the claimed systems. Applicant is advised to incorporate "processor" or "computer" to fix the deficiency.

b. Claims 39-49 are directed to a computer readable signal claim; which is not a physical product.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bocioned (US PG-Pub. No. 2002/0093537).

6. As per claim 16, Bocioned teaches the invention as claimed including a graphical user interface for use in an enterprise information system for managing data maintenance tasks across multiple applications, the graphical user interface (Abstract) comprising: a first portion including an enterprise task list, said enterprise task list including tasks generated outside the system at the multiple applications and tasks generated within the system (fig. 6; paragraph [0025]; [0007]; [0008]).

7. As per claim 17, Bocioned teaches a second portion including information regarding each of the tasks; and a third portion including predetermined instructions for working each of the tasks (fig. 5; paragraph [0027]).

8. As per claim 18, Bocioned teaches wherein said predetermined instructions include one or more links to websites outside of the system (paragraph [0026]).

9. As per claim 19, Bocioned teaches wherein said predetermined instructions for working each of the tasks is sorted according to a predetermined workflow (fig. 5; paragraph [0027]).

10. As per claim 20, Bocioned teaches wherein said first, second, and third portions are included in first, second, and third frames, respectively (fig. 6).

11. As per claim 21, Bocioned teaches wherein said second and third portions are included in layered, tabbed frames (fig. 6).

12. Claims 28-29 and 45-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ada Task Taxonomy Support for Concurrent Programming by Chi et. al. (ACM Software Engineering Notes hereinafter “Chi”).

13. As per claims 28-29 and 45-46, Chi teaches the invention as claimed A method of populating task data fields using task templates, the method comprising the steps of: populating each of the task data fields that are empty with data from corresponding data fields in a task definition template (page 8, section 3.3.3, lines 5-7); populating each of

the task data fields that are empty with data from corresponding data fields in a task name template (page 8, section 3.3.3, lines 5-10); populating each of the task data fields that are empty with data from corresponding data fields in a source object template (page 9, section 3.4, point 3); and populating each of the task data fields that are empty with data from corresponding data fields in a system template (page 9, section 3.4, point 5).

14. Claims 1-3, 9, 22 and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Seidman (US PG-Pub. No. 2002/0188644).

15. As per claims 1 and 36, Seidman teaches the invention as claimed including an enterprise information system for managing data maintenance tasks across multiple applications within an enterprise (Abstract), the system comprising: a task manager module having an enterprise task list, said enterprise task list including tasks generated outside the system at the multiple applications and tasks generated within the system (paragraph [0006] lines 14-17, 22-25); and a task engine module adapted to create tasks, said task engine module in communication with said task manager module (paragraph [006] lines 25-28).

16. As per claim 2, Seidman teaches wherein said task manager module further comprises predetermined task instructions for working each of the tasks (paragraph [0019]).

17. As per claims 3 and 37, Seidman teaches wherein said enterprise task list includes a plurality of data fields and said task manager module is adapted to sort said enterprise task list according to any one or more of said data fields (paragraph [0019]; e.g. browsing worklist).

18. As per claim 9, Seidman teaches wherein each of said predetermined task instructions includes one or more links to sites outside of the system (paragraph [0019]; e.g. external work processes).

19. As per claims 22 and 38, Seidman teaches the invention as claimed including a system architecture for centrally managing the creation of tasks comprising: a source object layer including one or more source objects, each of said one or more source objects having a corresponding event; a target object layer including one or more target objects (paragraph [0006] lines 22-28); and an enterprise task manager layer between said source object layer and said target object layer, wherein said enterprise task manager layer centrally manages relationships between each of said one or more source objects and each of said one or more target objects (fig. 7; paragraph [0022]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

21. Claims 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidman (US PG-Pub. No. 2002/0188644) in view of Brandt (US PG-Pub. No. 2003/0045958).

22. As per claim 4, Seidman does not explicitly teach wherein tasks created within said task engine module are communicated to said task manager module for inclusion in said enterprise task list.

23. Brandt teaches wherein tasks created within said task engine module are communicated to said task manager module for inclusion in said enterprise task list (paragraph [0019] lines 22-25).

24. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Seidman and Brandt so that the scope of the applicability of the invention can be widen to include enterprise tasks.

25. As per claim 5, Seidman teaches wherein tasks created by said task engine module are automatically worked by the system (paragraph [0006] lines 5-7).

26. As per claim 6, Brandt teaches wherein tasks created by said task engine module are presented to be worked by a user (paragraph [0023]).

27. As per claim 7, Brandt teaches wherein said task engine module automatically creates tasks according to defined rules (paragraph [0023]).

28. As per claim 8, Brandt teaches wherein said task engine module mines data across the enterprise information system according to said defined rules to identify missing or incorrect data and automatically creates tasks for correcting the missing or incorrect data (paragraph [0026], [0027]).

29. Claims 10-15 and 39-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidman (US PG-Pub. No. 2002/0188644) in view of Nguyen (US PG-Pub. No. 2003/0135384) further in view of Record (US Pat. No. 5,625,821) and further in view of Foodman (US PG-Pub. No. 2002/0005894).

30. As per claim 10, Seidman teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method of generating data maintenance tasks within an enterprise

information system, comprising the steps of: filing a source object and event to the system (paragraph [0021]); adding all system events to an event queue (paragraph [0019]; e.g. worklist); adding each of said custom events where said corresponding custom event ruleset is true to said event queue (paragraph [0019]; e.g. worklist); and generating a task for each of said custom or system events having a task definition ruleset that is true (paragraph [0006] lines 20-25).

31. Seidman does not explicitly teach determining whether said event is a custom event or a system event; determining for each of said custom events whether a corresponding custom event ruleset is true; and determining for each of said custom or system events in said event queue whether a task definition corresponding to each of said custom or system events exists; determining for each task definition corresponding to each of said custom or system events whether a task definition ruleset is true.

32. Nguyen teaches determining for each of said custom events whether a corresponding custom event ruleset is true (paragraph [0022]; e.g. rule evaluator) and determining for each task definition corresponding to each of said custom or system events whether a task definition ruleset is true (paragraph [0022]; e.g. rule evaluator).

33. Record teaches determining for each of said custom or system events in said event queue whether a task definition corresponding to each of said custom or system

events exists (col. 2, lines 39-43). But does not teach determining whether said event is a custom event or a system event.

34. Foodman teaches determining whether said event is a custom event or a system event (Abstract).

35. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Seidman, Nguyen, Record and Foodman so that that event management services permit associated event signalers, event definers and event handlers to operate in an efficient and optimum manner.

36. As per claim 11, Seidman teaches further comprising the step of adding said task to an enterprise task list (paragraph [0022]).

37. As per claim 12, Foodman teaches comprising the step of determining whether said task is a duplicate task (Abstract).

38. As per claim 13, Seidman teaches wherein at least one of said tasks generated is worked by the system (paragraph [0022]).

39. As per claim 14, Seidman teaches wherein at least one of said tasks generated is presented to be worked by a user (paragraph [0023]).

40. As per claim 15, Nguyen teaches wherein each of said tasks generated includes a predetermined set of instructions for working each of said tasks (paragraph [0021]).

41. As per claims 39-44; they are the signal claims of claims 10-15; therefore, they are rejected for the same reason as per claims 10-15 above.

42. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidman (US PG-Pub. No. 2002/0188644) in view of Nguyen (US PG-Pub. No. 2003/0135384).

43. As per claim 23, Seidman does not explicitly teach wherein said enterprise task manager further comprises a ruleset manager module including an event queue.

44. Nguyen teaches wherein said enterprise task manager further comprises a ruleset manager module including an event queue (paragraph [0011], lines 6-8; paragraph [0021]).

45. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Seidman and Nguyen so

that it will improve the system by dynamically and iteratively updated in response to changes.

46. Claims 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidman (US PG-Pub. No. 2002/0188644) in view of Nguyen (US PG-Pub. No. 2003/0135384) further in view of Record (US Pat. No. 5,625,821).

47. As per claim 24, Seidman does not teach wherein said ruleset manager receives each of said one or more source objects and corresponding event, determines whether one or more task definitions exist for each of said one or more source object and corresponding event, compares each of said one or more source object and corresponding event to predetermined task definition rule sets, and generates tasks to be performed on said one or more target objects based on said predetermined task definition rule sets.

48. Nguyen teaches wherein said ruleset manager receives each of said one or more source objects and corresponding event, and generates tasks to be performed on said one or more target objects based on said predetermined task definition rule sets (Abstract; paragraph [0021], [0022]); but does not explicitly teach determines whether one or more task definitions exist for each of said one or more source object and

corresponding event, compares each of said one or more source object and corresponding event to predetermined task definition rule sets.

49. Record reaches determines whether one or more task definitions exist for each of said one or more source object and corresponding event, compares each of said one or more source object and corresponding event to predetermined task definition rule sets (Abstract; col. 2, lines 39-43).

50. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Seidman, Nguyen and Record so that that event management services permit associated event signalers, event definers and event handlers to operate in an efficient and optimum manner.

51. As per claim 25, Record teaches wherein each of said corresponding events may be one of a system event and a custom event (col. 1, lines 17-23).

52. As per claim 26, Seidman teaches wherein each of said system events is automatically added to said event queue (paragraph [0019]).

53. As per claim 27, Record teaches wherein each of said custom events is compared to a custom event ruleset to determine whether to add said custom event to said event queue (col. 2, lines 39-43).

54. Claims 30-35 and 47-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidman (US PG-Pub. No. 2002/0188644) in view of ABLE: A toolkit for building multi-agent autonomic systems by Bigus et. al. (hereinafter Bigus) further in view of Record (US Pat. No. 5,625,821).

55. As per claim 30, Seidman teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method of automatically generating and performing tasks within an enterprise task management system, the method comprising the steps of: causing the system to generate tasks according to said predetermined ruleset of said agent (paragraph [0006] lines 22-28).

56. However, Seidman does not explicitly teach providing an agent including a predetermined ruleset; comparing data against said predetermined rules of said agent.

57. Bigus teaches providing an agent including a predetermined ruleset (page 352, right column, see ABLE agent framework lines 1-5; page 356, right column, *see* Rule Beans); but does not teach comparing data against said predetermined rules of said agent.

58. Record teaches comparing data against said predetermined rules of said agent (col. 2, lines 39-43).

59. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Seidman, Bigus and Record so that event management services permit associated event signalers, event definers and event handlers to operate in an efficient and optimum manner.

60. As per claim 31, Bigus teaches wherein said comparing step is performed at predetermined time intervals (see page 355, left column lines 16-26).

61. As per claim 32, Bigus teaches wherein a query including said comparing step may be performed at any time wherein a query including said comparing step may be performed at any time (see page 355, left column lines 16-26).

62. As per claim 33, Record teaches wherein said data is one or more source object and event pairs filed to the system (col. 1, lines 33-37).

63. As per claim 34, Record teaches wherein said data is task data (col. 2, lines 20-23).

64. As per claim 35, Seidman teaches providing an agent including a predetermined workflow for working a task; and causing the system to automatically work the task according to said predetermined workflow of said agent (paragraph [0021], [0022]).

65. As per claims 47-49; they are signal claims of claims 30-35; therefore, claims 47-49 are rejected for the same reason as per claims 30-35 above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Loren Chauhan whose telephone number is 571-270-1554. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thr. 9:30-5:00 (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lewis Bullock can be reached on 571-272-3759. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lewis A. Bullock, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2193

/Loren Chauhan/
Examiner, Art Unit 2193